Under the

Approved for use through 10/31/2002. OMB 0651-0031
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office: U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

## EQUEST

## **CONTINUED EXAMINATION (RCE) TRANSMITTAL**

Subsection (b) of 35 U.S.C. § 132, effective on May 29, 2000, provides for continued examination of an utility or plant application filed on or after June 8, 1995.

See The American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA).

Application Number	09/853,038			
Filing Date	May 11, 2001			
First Named Inventor	WATANABE et al.			
Group Art Unit	3679			
Examiner Name	Binda, Gregory John			
Attorney Docket Number	100725-00040			

<u>NOTE:</u> 37 C.F. wish to consider filing a the patent term adjustm	Continued Examination (RCE) under 3 R. § 1.114 is effective on May 29, 2000. If the above-ide continued prosecution application (CPA) under 37 C.F.R ent provisions of the AIPA. See Changes to application 16, 2000); Interim Rule, 65 Fed. Reg. 14865 (Mar. 20, 20 ce.	ntified application was filed p § 1.53(d) (PTO/SB/29) inste Examination and Provisions A	rior to May 29, 2000, applicant ead of a RCE to be eligible for Application Practice, Fine Rule,	may 17/By RRC	
1. Submission req	uired under 37 C.F.R. § 1.114				
i. 🛭 Cor 200	sly submitted nsider the amendment(s)/reply under 3 3 (Any unentered amendment(s) referred to above will b	e entered).	•	ch 4,	
iii. ☐ Oth b. ⊠ Enclose	ed	ef or Reply Brief pre	RECEI	VED	
<u> </u>	omission davit(s)/Declaration(s)		APR 0 8	2003	
iii. ☐ Info	ormation Disclosure Statement (IDS) ition for Extension of Time		GROUP	3600	
2. Miscellaneous  a. Suspension of action on the above-identified application is requested under 37 C.F.R. § 1.103(c) for					
a period	d of months. (Period of susp	pension shall not exceed	3 months; Fee under 37 C.I	• ' '	
3. Fees The RCE fee under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17(e) is required by 37 C.F.R. § 1.114 when the RCE is filed.					
to Depo i. ⊠ RC ii. ⊠ Ext iii. □ Oth	ector is hereby authorized to charge the sit Account No. 01-2300 making reference fee required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.170 tension of time fee (37 C.F.R. §§ 1.136 and the amount of \$ 1,050.00	ence to Attorney Do		040	
Name (Print/Type)	SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT,		OENT REQUIRED on No. (Attorney/Agent)	44,275	
Signature)	W 4000	Date	April 3, 2003	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	
	CERTIFICATE OF MA espondence is being deposited with the United St mmissioner For Patents, Box RCE, Washington, D	ates Postal Service with s	sufficient postage as first cla		
Name (Print/Type)					
Signature	1	Date	L		

Burden Hour Statement: This form is estimated to take 0.2 hours to complete. Time will vary depending upon the needs of the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you are required to complete this form should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, Washington, DC 20231. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND Fees and Completed Forms to the following address: Assistant Commissioner for Patents, Box RCE, Washington, DC 20231.



In re application of:

Confirmation No.: 5084

Yukihiro WATANABE et al.

Attorney Docket No: 100725-00040

Serial Number: 09/853,038

Group Art Unit: 3679

Filed: May 11, 2001

Examiner: Gregory John Binda

For: TRIPOD CONSTANT VELOCITY UNIVERSAL JOINT

## **SUBMISSION**

RECEIVED

APR 0 8 2003

Commissioner for Patents Washington, D.C. 20231

Date: April 3, 2003

**GROUP 3600** 

Sir:

Prior to initial examination of the above-identified application, Applicants respectfully submit the following comments to further support and bolster the comments regarding the requirements of 37 C.F.R. §1.71 and §1.75(d)(1) put forth in the Response dated March 4, 2003, which is being entered, along with this Submission, via the Request for Continued Examination within which this Submission is enclosed.

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1-23 are pending. Claims 8-23 have been withdrawn from consideration by the Examiner for being drawn to a non-elected species. No new matter is presented.

The Office Action dated November 4, 2002 objected to the Specification for failing to comply with 37 C.F.R. 1.71 and 1.75(d)(1) because the <u>detailed</u> description fails to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. Applicants respectfully traversed the objection in the Response dated March 4, 2003, and respectfully argued that the Office Action erroneously states the requirements of the relevant rules.